



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 8

Richard O. Bartz
Suite 350
6750 France Avenue South
Edina MN 55435

COPY MAILED

OCT 24 2002

In re Application of
John Mueller
Application No. 09/810,355
Filed: March 19, 2001
Attorney Docket No. M304.12.1

OFFICE OF PETITIONS
ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed October 3, 2002, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration or petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.137(a)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C § 704.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply to the non-final Office action mailed September 10, 2001, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months from its mailing date. A response was received by the Office on January 7, 2002, but the request for an extension of time was not received until February 15, 2002, with a certificate of mailing dated January 23, 2002. Petitioner was, therefore, in need of an extension of time within the second month to make the January 7, 2002, filing timely. No authorization to charge a deposit account for any outstanding amounts was found in the application file. The application, therefore became abandoned on January 11, 2002. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on April 17, 2002.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)¹ must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply,² unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(1); (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer required by 37 CFR 1.137(c).

The instant petition lacks item (3).

As to item (3), the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the

¹ As amended effective December 1, 1997. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53194-95 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 119-20 (October 21, 1997).

² In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.137(a).

The Commissioner is responsible for determining the standard for unavoidable delay and for applying that standard.

“In the specialized field of patent law, . . . the Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks is primarily responsible for the application and enforcement of the various narrow and technical statutory and regulatory provisions. The Commissioner’s interpretation of those provisions is entitled to considerable deference.”³

“[T]he Commissioner’s discretion cannot remain wholly uncontrolled, if the facts **clearly** demonstrate that the applicant’s delay in prosecuting the application was unavoidable, and that the Commissioner’s adverse determination lacked **any** basis in reason or common sense.”⁴

“The court’s review of a Commissioner’s decision is ‘limited, however, to a determination of whether the agency finding was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law.’”⁵

“The scope of review under the arbitrary and capricious standard is narrow and a court is not to substitute its judgement for that of the agency.”⁶

The standard

“[T]he question of whether an applicant’s delay in prosecuting an application was unavoidable must be decided on a case-by-case basis, taking all of the facts and circumstances into account.”⁷

The general question asked by the Office is: “Did petitioner act as a reasonable and prudent

³Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F.Supp. 900, 904, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff’d without opinion (Rule 36), 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir.1991) (citing Morganroth v. Quigg, 885 F.2d 843, 848, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg 849 F.2d 1422, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1152 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (“an agency’ interpretation of a statute it administers is entitled to deference”); see also Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defence Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837, 844, 81 L. Ed. 694, 104 S. Ct. 2778 (1984) (“if the statute is silent or ambiguous with respect to the specific issue, the question for the court is whether the agency’s answer is based on a permissible construction of the statute.”)

⁴Commissariat A L’Energie Atomique et al. v. Watson, 274 F.2d 594, 597, 124 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 126 (D.C. Cir. 1960) (emphasis added).

⁵Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987) (citing Camp v. Pitts, 411 U.S. 138, 93 S. Ct.1241, 1244 (1973) (citing 5 U.S.C. §706 (2)(A)); Beerly v. Dept. of Treasury, 768 F.2d 942, 945 (7th Cir. 1985); Smith v. Mossinghoff, 217 U.S. App. D.C. 27, 671 F.2d 533, 538 (D.C. Cir.1982)).

⁶Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1786 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (citing Motor Vehicles Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43, 77 L.Ed.2d 443, 103 S. Ct. 2856 (1983)).

⁷Id.

person in relation to his most important business?"⁸ Nonawareness of a PTO rule will not constitute unavoidable delay.⁹

Application of the standard to the current facts and circumstances

In the instant petition, petitioner maintains that the circumstances leading to the abandonment of the application meet the aforementioned unavoidable standard and, therefore, petitioner qualifies for relief under 37 CFR 1.137(a). In support thereof, petitioner asserts that the response to the non-final Office action, though mailed October 24, 2002, was not received until January 2002. It is assumed that petitioner is alleging that this was undue delay in receipt of the amendment. Although this may constitute undue delay, it does not constitute unavoidable delay. The reason petitioner's argument must necessarily fail is addressed below.

In the normal course, correspondence will be accorded a filing date as of the date received by the Office. Where, as in this case, it is alleged that a filing was received long after it was mailed the procedures provided in 37 CFR 1.8 and 1.10, which, if properly utilized, would allow the filing to be accorded a filing date as of the date originally mailed, transmitted, or deposited, respectively, rather than the date the filing is ultimately received by the Office. The certificate of mailing and transmission procedures under 37 CFR 1.8 allow for a filing date to be accorded as of the date the filing was mailed or transmitted rather than the date the filing was received by the Office provided the procedures set out in 37 CFR 1.8 are followed and the filing is not excepted under 37 CFR 1.8(2)(i). The procedures under 37 CFR 1.10 allows correspondence deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail" service pursuant to 37 CFR 1.10 to be accorded a filing date as of the "date-in" shown on the "Express Mail" label rather than the date the filing was received by the Office.

A review of the application file did not reveal a certificate of mailing for the amendment filed January 7, 2002, though it appears that petitioner was aware of the certificate of mailing procedures because a certificate of mailing accompanied the request for extension of time filed February 15, 2002. It may be concluded, therefore, that petitioner's failure to file the reply in compliance with 37 CFR 1.8 and/or 1.10 implies imprudence in the prosecution of the application which defeats petitioner's claim that the delay in filing the required reply was unavoidable.

Petitioner is advised that a successful petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must demonstrate that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for reply until the filing of a grantable petition was unavoidable. Petitioner did not establish that the six month delay in filing the instant petition was unavoidable. In any renewed petition filed, petitioner must establish that the entire period of delay was unavoidable--including any further undue delay in filing a renewed petition.

⁸See *In re Mattulah*, 38 App. D.C. 497 (D.C. Cir. 1912).

⁹See *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 977 (Fed. Cir. 1982) (citing *Potter v. Dann*, 201 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 574 (D.D.C. 1978) for the proposition that counsel's nonawareness of PTO rules does not constitute "unavoidable" delay)). Although court decisions have only addressed the issue of lack of knowledge of an attorney, there is no reason to expect a different result due to lack of knowledge on the part of a pro se (one who prosecutes on his own) applicant. It would be inequitable for a court to determine that a client who spends his hard earned money on an attorney who happens not to know a specific rule should be held to a higher standard than a pro se applicant who makes (or is forced to make) the decision to file the application without the assistance of counsel.

In the alternative, petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition to revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required reply (already submitted), the required petition fee (\$1,280.00 for a large entity and \$640.00 for a verified small entity), and a statement that the **entire** delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. A copy of a blank petition form PTO/SB/64 is enclosed for petitioner's convenience.


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, DC 20231

By facsimile: (703) 308-6916
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Office of Petitions
2201 South Clarke Place
Crystal Plaza 4, Suite 3C23
Arlington, Virginia 22202

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-0010.



Kenya A. McLaughlin
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

Enclosure: PTO/SB/64